



# Guidance for Reporting on User Group Workshops

## Background

The I~work consortium is investigating the role of Inclusive Work in an Ageing Society. The consortium will carry out a series of workshops to engage appropriate stakeholders as part of framing research that will guide the development of a full research proposal. We will use these user-group meetings to:

- a. Test out our initial ideas and work packages
- b. Start a dialogue with key stakeholders & potential partners
- c. Help us to identify steering committee members & ‘critical’ friends

Host Institutions can choose whether to hold group workshops or one-to-one sessions. Either way, results need to be captured and documented for distribution to I~Work members (and placed on the I~Work web portal). The user-group meetings will be divided into the following areas and hosted by the core partners.

Host institution	User group	Potential Participants
Cambridge	Human resources & business groups	CBI, CIPD, SMEs, Employers Forum on Age, corporates
Warwick	Employment intermediaries	TAEN, Prime, TUC, unions, Business Link, recruitment agencies
ILC-UK	Policy & government	DWP, DTI, Regional Assemblies, Regional Development Associations, Age Concern, Help the Aged
RCA	Architecture & design community	Design Council, architects, interior designers, engineers
Surrey/ Notts/ HSL	Health, ergonomics & human factors	NHS Institute for Innovation & Improvement, Health & Safety Executive, occupational health experts, Engineering Employers’ Federation

These user-group meetings are open to any i~work core member who’s interested. We should also send a list of dates & venues to Alan Walker, NDA Programme Director.

We need a co-ordinated approach to this, to prevent:

1. The same people being invited to more than 1 user workshop
2. Certain key individuals being missed out of all workshops (due to one institution presuming this was the territory of another’s)
3. Clashes in dates

We agreed that each host should organise the event as they see fit. But there is also an argument for consistency in terms of how we present ourselves as an integrated consortium.

## Purpose of this Document

The aim of this document is to have an agreed and coordinated approach to the setting-up of the meetings and the reporting of the results. The main aim is to make sure all of the reported results are compatible and can be compared and consolidated.

## Research Design and Methodology

The host institutions will be responsible for the choice of participants, organisation, research methodology, execution and results analysis as they deem appropriate. The only restriction is that there are some common research questions that should be posed. This is so we can gather base-line feedback

that can be compared across the groups and to focus all groups on a common starting point. These common questions should be seen as a way of starting dialogue which should cascade into group specific issues and allow for emergent issues to be generated.

With the full agreement of the Participants, the host institutions are encouraged to either audio or video record the proceedings. Each group will need to consider the ethical implications for their research group and take any necessary steps to address any concerns. Groups should also consider whether or not the Participants should be offered a post event evaluation form, see Appendix B.

## **Confidentiality**

The competitive nature of the NDA Research Programme makes it critical that we consult only those people prepared to respect the confidentiality of the information we distribute. Any discussions with User Groups must be based on this premise. It is up to host partners to decide whether to handle this informally or in writing. Below is the relevant section of an email from TAEN, The Age and Employment Network, laying out its position over working jointly with two competing NDA preparatory networks:

*TAEN strongly supports the range of work and partners you have proposed. We regard progress on these subjects as essential for extending quality working life. TAEN would therefore welcome the opportunity to play a consultancy role in relation to the Partnership.*

*We are aware that the University of Loughborough is working on a somewhat similar project. TAEN has had contact with them and have suggested similar services to them, if their project should go ahead. TAEN wishes to see the most effective and relevant research on age and employment go ahead. We have no opinion on which Partnerships should be selected and would not express one, but would like to see the research take place with input from ourselves.*

*TAEN commits to respect the confidentiality of your proposals. As we are not a research organisation we do not see a conflict of interest in having parallel links with the two NDA Partnerships related to employment.*

We must think carefully about how we consult with individuals who will also be approached by members of the Loughborough network. In some ways, there is merit in targeting these individuals, so that we don't find ourselves excluded from certain key partnering organisations. But this depends on :

- their willingness to respect the sensitivity of the information disclosed to them
- our willingness to trust them, based on past dealings, gut instincts and potential conflicts of interest

## **Costs and Expenses**

The network grant will cover reasonable costs for organising the meetings and paying expenses to participants. If the total cost is likely to exceed £300 per meeting, please inform and agree the Costs with Kerry Platman in advance. Expense claim forms are available for download from the I-Work web portal.

## **Reporting the Results**

A proforma for reporting the results is in Appendix C.

## Appendix A: User Group Details

Host Institution	User Group Name	Participants	Date	Place
Cambridge	Human resources & business groups	NAME (representing)	19 <sup>th</sup> June 2007 (Provisional)	Cambridge?
Warwick	Employment intermediaries		Week of 11-15 June	London
ILC-UK	Policy & government		Week of 11-15 June	London
RCA	Architecture & design community			
Surrey/ Notts/ HSL	Health, ergonomics & human factors			

## Appendix B: Participant Evaluation

### Evaluation Form

<to be drafted>

## Appendix C: Consultation Report

### Details

**Host Institution:** <University of Cambridge>  
**User Group Name:** < Human resources & business groups>  
**Date(s) & Time(s):** <19 June 2007>  
**Place(s):** <Trinity Hall University of Cambridge>  
**Data Guardian:** <Pat Langdon>

### Attendee List:

Participant	Sex (M or F)	Age (Years)	Employer	Position	Location	Why/How recruited
	M F					

### Preparatory information

1. I~Work flyer
2. NDA programme: aims, objectives & application process
3. I~Work's mission: long-term, strategic & multi-disciplinary partnership

## Posed Research Questions

1. What are the future threats which will prevent us realising the potential of an ageing workforce?
  - How can we address those threats?
2. What are the costs involved in supporting a healthy older workforce?
  - How can we minimise those costs?
3. What are the productivity (& performance management) tests which older workers are most likely to fail?
  - What metrics could we use instead to measure the competence & productivity of an ageing workforce?
4. How can we change workplace systems (tools, instruments, metrics, work spaces...) so that they are more inclusive and provide a better fit for an ageing society?
5. How can we change work tasks, careers & training so that they are more inclusive and provide a better fit for an ageing society?
6. What would our research need to do in order to change policies, practices, attitudes and cultures?

## Methodology Used

<please describe the methodology used including:

1. Participant sampling strategy,
2. research structuring and how run etc
3. data collection and recording
4. data analysis.>

## Results Summary

### Answers to Posed Research Questions

1. A
2. B
3. C

### List of Emergent Issues

1. X
2. Y
3. Z

### Barriers and Opportunities

1. M
2. N
3. O